/65 cont./

524 child" or "married couple." In the latter game sexual activity
524 is already often involved. As long as the children have not yet
864 reached puberty, the adults laugh about it. It is only the mothers of girls who are a little annoyed when they hear about it. They do not regard it as tragic, however, since they themselves were reprimanded about it by their mothers when they were little girls.

/66/

582 g) Marriage

At the age of 7-8 a girl as a rule has already been given in
585 marriage. The husband is usually 8-10 years older. They do not as yet lead a regular married life, however. During the day the little girl plays with other children, and only at night does she sleep
[833] in her hammock beside her husband. Sexual intercourse, however,
[593] is strictly forbidden until after the second menstruation. She also fetches firewood and water and receives prepared food for herself and her husband from her family. When the tribe is on the march,
[484] she carries the hammock of her spouse and the few household articles. Economic reasons are connected with this marriage in childhood, for the young husband must hunt for his little wife and
● 606 her parents. Especially noteworthy is the reserve toward in-laws which operate in such a way that son-in-law and mother-in-law never
582 speak to each other and may not visit each other. Since the fear of incest is very great in both tribes, a marriage, which is always agreed upon by the parents, may be entered into only by partners who are not related by kinship. For this reason young wives are preferably obtained from a friendly tribe; in this case, however, the young man must live there until his wife has put her second
583 menstruation behind her. Occasionally young girls and women are abducted from hostile tribes. They are first held as captives and prostitutes for some time, however, before a man may finally marry them. I met such a little female captive among the Surára. She came from the hostile tribe of the Karauaterí and was approximately 15 or 16 years old.

/114 cont./
539 discipline of the tribe. Since all admonitions were of no avail, he was banished from the community.

Karemoná painted his body with urucú and left the maloka. After he had wandered about in the forest for a few hours, he lay down wearily on the ground and fell asleep. While he was asleep Poré transformed him into the jibóia-vermelha (Epicrates cenchris) -- oatá -- because of his insubordination.

539
825

The Creation of the Black Jaguar

The Surára were already acquainted with clearing by burning and cultivated banana trees and pupunha palms. One day they saw a large toad in the forest clearing. A Surára wanted to kill it, but it fled to the other /115/ side of the roça (forest clearing) and there turned into a black jaguar.

The Creation of the Tapir

A cuatá monkey fell from a tall tree and was unable to climb up again. After several unsuccessful attempts, it turned into a tapir.

The Creation of Wild Pigs

A band of cuxiú monkeys fell from a tall tree. After futile attempts at climbing up again they were transformed into wild pigs.

The Creation of the Ant Bear

539
606
262

A Surára man who had raped his mother-in-law was turned into an ant bear by Poré as punishment. Since then there has been in-law avoidance between mother-in-law and son-in-law, and the meat of the ant bear may not be eaten by members of the tribe.

/211 cont./ There are
601 personal names which an individual receives from the theurgist,
551 but the kinship term seems to be used more in daily contact be-
[689 tween persons. It is considered an offense to mention the name
[825 of a deceased person in the presence of any of his relatives, and,
as we mentioned before, kinship terms are extended even to
speaking with certain animals during the hunt.

●606 In general, dealings between persons are very free, with the exception of the strong prohibitive taboo which exists between the son-in-law and his mother-in-law and father-in-law. Usually, one must not approach one's wife's parents. Only in cases of emergency can this be done, thus breaking the custom. These cases of emergency come about, for instance, during a battle, when one of the persons is wounded.

597 The adoption of an orphan takes place informally when it is a matter of a small child. The family that adopts him takes him in like another one of its own members. Older children also live in a family of the group, but they are not adopted, properly speaking, for they are not given specific kinship denominations. We do not think that there are special terms to express a relationship of adoption.

554 Regarding the social structure, it seems that the main distinctions are those of sex and age. The man who carries out his daily tasks with dexterity enjoys great prestige among his peers, and those who are really successful in their work rise to the top of /212/ the social hierarchy. In Sanemá society the three theurgists which we shall mention later on enjoy high rank; but we must repeat the fact that the data regarding this matter which we present here are provisional and therefore subject to possible modification.

554 As we shall see, Sanemá society seems to have three different theurgists: a "magician" /mago/, a shaman, and a priest.
791 This last one possesses characteristics of a real specialist, since,
756 for the most part, he earns his living from his office. There is not
793 the least doubt but that the theurgists in general, and the shaman and priest in particular, represent the most influential position in Sanemá society; particularly if the two offices are carried out
000 by one and the same person. We were greatly surprised to find

/217 cont./

606 The husband helps economically the family of orientation of his wives, supplies them with produce from the conuco, but dealings with his wife's parents are reduced the most indispensable ones. When he meets his mother-in-law on the path, he changes his direction immediately, does not greet her, and would not dare to speak to her for anything. Between father-in-law and son-in-law there exists a cold friendship from which all manifestations of cordiality are absent. The same taboo exists between parents-in-law and daughter-in-law.

836 The Sanemá of the Erebato assured us that an unmarried young man could have sexual relations with all the unattached girls of his group and that very often the girls are the ones who [584] take the initiative in this. When a boy is attractive, he joins up with one or two girls, who /218/ in all frankness and good faith ask him to stay with them for a few nights more, offer him food, and hope that he will resolve to ask one of them to marry him.

593 It seems that in general women do not abandon their hus-
937 bands and confidently expect the spouse to behave in the same manner and not have extramarital sexual relations.

593 Frequently angry fights arise in the family out of passional
586 motives, to the point where the man no longer tolerates it and leaves the rancheria forever and eventually marries another woman in a distant pueblo.

595 Usually, only older men have several wives; polyandry
587 is not permitted. Widows, as a general rule, marry a brother of
607 the deceased husband, who takes his nieces and nephews under
[836] his protection. This custom does not cause any great problems, since the brother of the deceased has already had sexual intercourse with his sisters-in-law before marrying them, for he has
587 always considered them as possible wives. Nor do the children
593 find it difficult to accept their new father, whom they have al-
[601] ways called "father" and he has called them "children." In
[184] this way the Sanemá (and also the Waica, Surará, and Pakidai) are a society which allows polygamy, the sororate, and the levirate.

/478 cont./

628 728 been killed, might require a greater number of years to be reconciled. Disputes which have reached the proportions of regional wars are rarely forgotten within the same generation, since there is hardly any neutral settlement left by means of which peace negotiations can be made.

The Family

591 606 A newly married couple may live in the settlement of the wife's parents or in that of the husband's parents. But if they decide to live in the settlement of the wife's parents, they cannot live in the same dwelling with them, because it is prohibited (taboo) for the husband to approach his mother-in-law. He can enter her house only when she is outside. He would not dare to come any closer to her than three or four meters. If the couple decides to live with the husband's parents, there are no such restrictions, since there is no prohibition against the daughter-in-law approaching her mother-in-law. Even suitors customarily lodge on the side opposite that of the house of their future mother-in-law, in their town.

595 [578] The majority of the men have but one wife. Those who wish to, and are able to, may have two or more wives. This practice makes more acute the shortage of marriageable women and may be one of the principal causes of the fights over wives which are started by men who have remained without any.

When a man has more than one wife, his wives may live in the same house or in several houses in a row. They work together, but each one has her own property. Frequently they are sisters since a man is more likely to marry the sister of his wife than to find another wife elsewhere.

593 Within the family it is the man who exercises authority. I only know of one case where the woman gives orders in the house, and this because her husband is mentally deficient.

*628 613 591 583 • 606 Koima, a girl of some 15 years, was promised to Rerebawë, a young man from Karohi-tedi, an ally of the Bisaasi-tedi. Rerebawë had already been given Koima's older sister, Shihotama, by whom he had two children. Rerebawë wished to return to his own village, as he had performed a lengthy bride service. His parents-in-law, however, wanted him to remain in Bisaasi-tedi permanently, as they had no sons to help them with the gardening or to provide them with meat. Rerebawë began making frequent trips to his own village. His wife's parents feared that he might not return, so they kept his wife's children in Bisaasi-tedi, knowing that she would return even if her husband did not. This coercion was not working effectively, and Rerebawë was growing impatient. His parents-in-law, therefore, promised him Koima, their second daughter, 584 813 591 578 735 613 *624 627 provided that he remain in Bisaasi-tedi. Koima, however, refused to go to Rerebawë, suspecting that he would not keep his promise to remain in Bisaasi-tedi. She preferred, instead, Bïkotawë, her classificatory FaSiSo. She began an affair with Bïkotawë, making no attempt to be discreet. This infuriated Rerebawë, who challenged Bïkotawë to a club fight. Bïkotawë belonged to one of the important lineages in Bisaasi-tedi and was cognatically related to the members of the headman's [626] descent group, another important lineage. Public sentiment was on Bïkotawë's side, but the girl belonged to a descent group over whose affairs Bïkotawë's supporters had no claims. Rerebawë's challenge was legitimate, for the girl was promised to him by her agnates: Bïkotawë was, in effect, having an

602 of social organization,[1] and in analyses of particular societies.[2] It is not assumed here that the nature of the [114] social organization itself stems from the nature of the sentiments associated with particular dyadic kin ties, as was implied in Homans and Schneider's work (1955). Dyadic ties are a product of political, military, ideological and economic forces that shape Yanomamö social organization, and reflect, rather than cause, that organization.

Of the large number of logically possible kinship dyads, only a few have structural relevance to this analysis. In particular, ties between agnates and ties between brothers-in-law must be considered to render intelligible the mechanics of Yanomamö social organization.

602 *621 578 Ties between distantly related agnates are the most ambiguous, and the ones that usually break when villages split. Conversely, ties between closely related agnates are strong and less likely to be severed in village splits.

609 Of the affinal ties, those linking brothers-in-law to each other are of the greatest structural importance and are often stronger than ties between distantly related agnates. 606 601 Secondarily, ties between a man and his son-in-law are strong, but have fewer structural consequences than either brother-in-law (shoriwä) or brother (aiwä, osheya) ties.

---

[1] Levi-Strauss, 1963, Ch. 2; Needham, 1962, Ch. 2.

[2] Leach, 1957.

000 groups. In a large village comprised of two large lineages,
*621 each having two or more local descent groups, the particular
613 local descent groups of each lineage will have stronger ties
602 with non-agnatic descent groups within that village than with
598 groups of distantly related agnates. When there are feuds within the village, the groups that have most in common with each other are those linked by affinal rather than agnatic ties, and these affinally linked groups stick together should the feud lead to a village split.[1] While the tie between
[607] closely related agnates is stronger than that between brothers-in-law, the latter are usually stronger than the ties between distantly related agnates.

• 606 Finally, the son-in-law tie complements the brother-
609 in-law tie in binding local descent groups to each other
*621 within villages. Older adult males of local descent groups
613 can depend on the support of brothers, brothers-in-law, and
578 sons-in-law in village feuds, more so than on the support of
582 distantly related agnates. In the competition for women, affines in a faction exchange women rather than compete for them; just the opposite is true of the relationships between distantly related agnates.

2. Agnatic ties

593 *621 One of the two most important consanguineal ties having structural concomitants among the Yanomamö is the tie between siblings of the opposite sex. These are not as

[128] [1]See Chapter IV for a detailed discussion of the structure of village factions.

628 same lineages. The warfare between the two groups, therefore,
602
613
726 was largely a struggle between groups of distantly related
621 agnates. Kɨobawë, the headman of Upper Bisaasi-tedi, participated in the raiding against the Patanowë-tedi. In one skirmish, he shot his classificatory brother, Rakoiwë, but Rakoiwë survived the wound. This man is as closely related to Kɨobawë as most of the men that presently constitute his agnatic following in Upper Bisaasi-tedi, again illustrating the significance of co-residence in determining the strength
583 of the agnatic tie. Two young men from Patanowë-tedi recently joined the Bisaasi-tedi to obtain wives. After they arrived, the Bisaasi-tedi and the Patanowë-tedi resumed their old
606 hostilities. The fathers-in-law of the two men recruited
583 both of them into raiding parties that attacked the Patanowë-tedi, and both men participated willingly, despite the fact that their actual fathers and brothers live in Patanowë-tedi. One of the young men, Sirorowë, told me that he would have avoided shooting his own father (Yoyosiwë) and actual brothers, but would have shot more distant agnates.

628 That the brother-in-law tie is stronger than the tie
726 between distantly related agnates is also illustrated in the
602 history of a war between Mahekodo-tedi and Yabitawë-tedi.
609 These two villages are led by men who are classificatory
622 brothers. The war stated when a man from Boreta-tedi, a brother-in-law of the headman of Mahekodo-tedi, was killed by the Yabitawë-tedi headman in a club fight. As the slain man's sisters were married to the Mahekodo-tedi headman, the

602 661 *621 *628 It is not easy to represent affinal ties in this fashion, as there are too many factors that determine the strength of the relationship between such kin types. A few observations, however, will provide a contrast with the analysis given in Table 3 above. Among affines, age differential is relatively meaningless so far as internal village stability and strength of inter-village alliance is concerned. * [604] When the age differential corresponds to a difference in genealogical level, the affines, such as son-in-law, tend to be related by stable roles based on avoidance, bride service obligations, etc., but these derive not from age differential, [606] but from the generation difference. A son-in-law is subordinate to a father-in-law despite his age, and inter-personal behavior between such kinsmen is not greatly influenced by [591] age differentials. Second, co-residence is largely irrelevent unless it reflects cognatic ties that came about through previous marriages in ascending generations. Again, current political relationships between the two villages of the affines is important in determining the strength of the tie, or whether the affine intends to return to his own village. *628 Affinal ties do not necessarily imply previous historical *621 relationships between the groups of the affines, whereas 602 583 agnatic ties presume a common history. When members of two historically distinct villages enter into marriage alliances with each other, affinal ties between the respective villages are weaker than affinal ties between members of two villages that have a common history and have exchanged women in the

one real headman, Kaobäwä. Thus, Paruriwä had to separate from Kaobäwä's group to achieve a status equal to that of Kaobäwä.

In July 1965 Kaobäwä sent his brother-in-law, Kumamawä, to Patanowä-tedi to inform them that his group did not intend to raid the Patanowä-tedi in the future. When Kumamawä returned to Bisaasi-tedi, he brought two older people with him, demonstrating that the Patanowä-tedi trusted Kaobäwä and were anxious to promote good relations with his group. The older couple brought the message that three young men from Patanowä-tedi were coming on a visit soon. Three days later the young men, Harokoiwä, Masiwä, and Koiyeiwä, arrived. Paruriwä's group was visiting the Widokaiya-tedi, and when word reached him that a delegation of Patanowä-tedi had arrived at Bisaasi-tedi to visit Kaobäwä, he and a group of men from Monou-tedi immediately returned to Bisaasi-tedi, intending to murder the three visitors. Kaobäwä, however, warned Paruriwä and the Monou-tedi that should they attempt to harm the visitors, he and his followers would defend them with force. A crisis developed out of this situation, and for a whole day Paruriwä and his Monou-tedi supporters debated the wisdom of their plan. Finally, Paruriwä decided to desist from the murders and even participated in a news chant with one of the Patanowä-tedi--the father of his youngest wife. This emphasised Kaobäwä's influence as a leader, and Paruriwä decided to move away from Kaobäwä's group after this incident. The Monou-tedi who were to participate in the murder of the three

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

him to do a favor, whereas he could ask this of a brother-in-law.[6] As shall presently be seen, the dynamics of Yąnomamö social organization originate in the politics of obtaining a wife. Within this context, agnates are competitors and affines are allies. This has an important effect on the manner in which villages fission and form new groups. The point to remember at this juncture is that ties of marriage are in many cases stronger than ties of blood.

I emphasize this because many anthropologists argue from "first principles" that ties of blood are—by definition—more capable of promoting solidarity and amity than ties by marriage. The controversy over "complementary filiation" between E. R. Leach (1957) and M. Fortes (1959), still not satisfactorily resolved, was essentially a debate about the analytical significance of marriage ties. Focusing on only one of the issues and rephrasing the arguments so as to apply to Fig. 3–2, the debate ran something like this: Both Leach and Fortes seemed to agree that in societies having lineal descent groups (lineages), the descent groups would tend to fall apart unless some kind of tie bound the members to each other. That is, lineages X and Y of Fig. 3–2 would, in short, pull away from each other unless they were held together by some special social tie. Fortes argued that this special tie was the solidarity and amity that grew out of the cognatic (see Glossary) kinship ties between the two lineages which arise when individuals marry blood relatives. Looking at generation V, for example, Fortes would argue that lineages X and Y are bound to each other because x_8 and y_8 married women to whom they are related by blood (as FaSiDa and MoBrDa). He argues from first principles that solidarity emanates from the blood ties. Leach, however, states that in generation V the two lineages are bound to each other by obligations to reciprocate goods, services, and women and that the solidarity of the two lineages derives from the affinal ties themselves (shown as "15" and "16" in Fig. 3–2). If we look only at generation V, the argument cannot be resolved, since the data support both arguments equally well, or at least do not convincingly support one rather than the other. I might add that both arguments can be supported by data not given in Fig. 3–2; Fortes' arguments are supported, for example, by the additional fact that Yąnomamö men do not stringently have to avoid their mothers-in-law when they are related to them in the fashion shown in Fig. 3–2, whereas the avoidance taboo is very onerous when a man's mother-in-law is not a blood relative. If, however, attention is focused on the events of generation III and their consequences examined, it can readily be seen that the affinal (marriage) ties in generation V are stronger than some of the agnatic (blood) ties, and the latter break when the village fissions. (This can be even more readily seen in Fig. 3–4 and 3–5, discussed later.) Thus, it cannot be argued that Yąnomamö lineage solidarity derives exclusively from blood ties and "complementary filiation." There is another issue. Structural analyses depend in large measure on a sharp distinction between marriage (affinal) ties and blood (consanguineal) ties. Fortes seems to deny that affinal ties as such exist independently of blood ties, and he has "subsumed" them into his concept of "complementary filiation." If there is no such thing as affinal ties between lineal descent groups, then structural

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 61]

[6] In addition, it is by no means rare for agnates to get into club fights over women. I even have recorded a number of cases of men shooting and killing a "brother" during raids. This happened on two occasions during my first stay in the field, and I have reports of several additional cases obtained from informants who were describing past raids.

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

analysis of reciprocal marriage exchanges between such groups and the obligations implied in such exchange is seriously hampered. In short, if Yąnomamö marriage exchanges over a number of generations and the kinship basis of village fusioning are examined, the data support Leach's arguments. They do not, however, invalidate Fortes' argument that blood ties create some solidarity, but they do call into question the contention that blood ties by definition, or, rather, on "first principles," account exclusively for the solidarity occurring between lineages.

In summary, Fig. 3-1 represents a number of important features of Yąnomamö social organization. First, people reckon descent through males and are grouped into exogamous, patrilineal lineages. These are called *mashi* by the Yąnomamö, although none of them bear distinctive names.[7] Second, members of these lineages tend to intermarry with the members of a second lineage over a number of generations, being bound to them by obligations to reciprocate women in marriage. This results in a dual organization of kinsmen within the village, whose residents fall into one or the other of the two lineages. Third, new lineages can be incorporated into the village by an extension of marriage ties, potentially bringing about "structural faults" within the lineages of that village. Fourth, men are obliged to marry a woman of a single, specific category, *naabiya*. This category defines a variety of women, two subcategories of which can be translated into the English biological equivalents MoBrDa and FaSiDa. Yąnomamö men prefer to marry women of these subcategories because they are relieved of much of the discomfort of avoiding their mothers-in-law.[8]

The ten partial genealogies shown in Fig. 3-2 show how the Yąnomamö actually marry. The genealogies have been selected with the intention of illustrating how the Yąnomamö reckon relationships between kinsmen in general, and between husband and wife in particular. All ten exemplify prescriptive marriage. They are more or less arranged in decreasing order of correspondence to our own biological concepts of kinship and illustrate the classificatory nature of their kinship system.

The people shown on these genealogies are (or were) real people. Many of the individuals in the examples are related to each other in such ways that all ten of the examples could be drawn as a single, unified genealogy.

The first eight examples are drawn from the village of Patanowä-teri; the last two are from Bisiasi-teri. In case J, for example, the fifth individual of the second generation is Kąobawä. To give a rough idea of the incompleteness of each genealogy, only one of Kąobawä's four marriages is shown and only one of his four children. None of his brothers and sisters are shown either, nor is the fact that he married a MoBrDa indicated.

Case A illustrates the identification procedure to be used in relating the genealogies to the text. There are three generations shown in case A; the first is symbolized by the Roman numeral I, the second, by II, the third, by III. Each individual in each generation is given a number; the number series runs from left to right and begins anew with 1 in each generation. Hence, every individual bears a generation number and a position-within-generation number. Case A illustrates the marriage of individuals III-1 to III-2;

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 63]

[7] *Mashi* means "species," "group," "cluster of similar things," and, in the context of kinship, "that group of people to whom I am related through males;" that is, "patrilineal kinsmen."

[8] I draw attention to the fact that the category is *prescribed*, but within it there are *preferences*. There are very few analyses of societies that have a prescriptive rule within which there are preferences, although Needham has devoted some attention to this interesting phenomenon (1962a, 1962b, and 1963).

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

that is, the marriage of individuals 1 and 2 of the third generation. Although the ten examples are given primarily to illustrate the marriage of individuals of the most recent generation (3 or 4, depending on the number of generations in each example), in some cases additional marriages in ascending generations will be discussed. The point to remember for the time being is that the genealogies should be looked at from the most recent generation; the marriage pattern can be more readily seen in this fashion.

Case A: This exemplifies the *matrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, sometimes called MoBrDa marriage. Here, the Yąnomamö category *nabąba* corresponds exactly with our biological translation to MoBrDa. The man in question (III–1) would have called the woman *nabąba* whether or not he married her. Similarly, she would have addressed him by the term for husband: *hąmąya*.

The marriage of III–1 to III–2 in this case also exemplifies *patrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, for the woman is related to her husband as FaSiDa as well. This is so because individuals II–1 and II–4 are siblings (brother and sister to each other) because their own fathers, in turn, were brothers. (Individual I–2 was an *adopted* brother to I–3, hence the broken sibling line connecting them.) When an individual marries a woman who is simultaneously his FaSiDa and MoBrDa, he is said to marry his *bilateral cross-cousin*. Case A illustrates the preferred form of marriage, for the man does not have to avoid his wife's parents as stringently as he would were they related to him in a different fashion. When a man's father-in-law is his MoBr, he is on extremely intimate terms with him and can even make jokes at his expense. The intimacy of the relationship between a man and his MoBr was brought home to me very indelibly on one occasion. A group of Patanowä-teri men visited Kąobawä, although their two villages were at war. One of the visitors was Kąobawä's wife's brother. After this man rested in a hammock for a few minutes, he got up and found Ariwari, Kąobawä's son. Ariwari was the visitor's sister's son. He played with him in the hammock and hugged him intimately (see Fig. 3–3). Ariwari fell asleep in his arms. This took place in spite of the fact that the visitors were in danger of being killed by other members of Kąobawä's group and narrowly escaped death on their previous visit. (See the section "Division of Labor and Daily Social Life" later in this chapter for a description of the incident.)

Case B: This illustrates the same kind of marriage that took place in Case A, except that the parents of the married people are half-siblings to each other. The Yąnomamö do not distinguish half-siblings from full siblings, so this situation is identical, as far as they are concerned, to the marriage in case A.

Case B also illustrates *several polygyny*: III–1 married two women who were related to each other as sisters.

Finally, it should be noted that the father of the man in question married a sister to individual II–3. They stood in wife-giver/wife-receiver relationship to each other and so do their children.

Case C: This illustrates the *patrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, that is, the FaSiDa marriage. Like the MoBrDa marriage, it is preferred because the man does not have to avoid his wife's parents. It is considered to be incestuous for a man to be familiar with his wife's mother if the woman is still sexually active. Hence, he must avoid her. If she is his FaSi, however, incest prohibitions pertaining to that kinswoman would automatically call forth appropriate behavior on his part, and the avoidance taboo is not stringent.

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

606 123 [551] The avoidance taboo prohibits a man from saying his mother-in-law's name. My informants would be extremely embarrassed when I would say the name of their mother-in-law while collecting genealogies. Kąobawä, for example, would grin sheepishly and hide his head. Men must also avoid their mothers-in-law physically and should not look at them. If I took a group of people for a ride in my canoe, there would always be considerable shuffling of bodies so that the men could be situated in the canoe as far away from their mothers-in-law as possible.

128 602 595 Finally, case C illustrates another kind of sororal polygyny: Individuals III-1 and III-3 are sisters to each other because their mothers are sisters. (The equation stating that children of siblings of the same sex are themselves siblings extends indefinitely in the case of males, but breaks down in the case of females after two generations. This is because descent is patrilineal.)

128 582 602 *Case D:* This also is a case of FaSiDa marriage: I-2 and I-3 were brothers, so one of the parents of each of the third generation individuals were brother and sister to each other. Hence, III-1 married his FaSiDa.

128 595 602 *Case E:* The marriage of III-1 to III-2 is similar to the marriage in case D, but his marriage to the second wife, III-3, illustrates the use of another kinship equation. She is an actual sister to the first wife, but does not stand in the FaSiDa relationship to her husband. If one of the sisters is FaSiDa, however, then all of them are in Yąnomamö kinship usage.

128 582 602 [601] *Case F:* This illustrates how affinal ties replace consanguineal ties should the two conflict. III-1 can trace a blood tie to his wife, one that would prevent him from marrying her, but the affinal ties between his own father and the father of his wife permit him to marry according to the prescription. Individual III-1 would call all of his father's wives "mother." Hence, his own wife is, technically, MoBrDa.

128 582 587 602 [597] *Case G:* This illustrates a number of marriage rules stated in the preceding examples. I present it as a sort of exercise to reinforce the logic of the Yąnomamö kinship equations given above. Individual II-6 married two brothers, II-5 and II-7, illustrating the *levirate*: the marriage between a man and his brother's widow. Individual II-9 married his FaSiDa (as in case F). Individuals III-3 and III-4 can marry because their fathers were cross-cousins (see case H, below). Individual III-5 married his FaSiDa, as was shown for the similar marriage in case E. Individual IV-1 married two women, each of whom is his FaSiDa. This is so because I-2 and I-4 were adopted brothers, so that their sons (II-2 and II-4) were also siblings. Hence, IV-1 married his FaSiDa (IV-2) and, as in case E, her sister. His second wife is also FaSiDa because her mother (III-6) was a sister to III-2, since their respective fathers (II-9 and II-2) were (adopted) brothers.

128 582 601 602 *Case H:* This illustrates a very powerful marriage rule: The children of men who call each other *sherimä* (brother-in-law) can marry. Practically speaking, in our kinship terms, the rule is that the children of cross-cousins stand in marriageable relationship to each other. II-2 and II-3 stand in wife-giver/wife-receiver relationship to each other and could exchange sisters in marriage. Their sons stand in the same relationship. Another important feature of Yąnomamö kinship and marriage rules is illustrated here. While III-1 married a woman of the prescribed category, he does not reckon his relationship to her patrilaterally or matrilaterally. That is, she is neither FaSiDa nor MoBrDa, but she is both! This emphasizes the fact that they marry primarily in terms of categories rather than by tracing biological ties, as I have done in the above examples. To the Yąnomamö,

11: Chagnon E-6 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

other when they are children and young men. As time passes and these men become old enough to seek wives, members of the groups to which they belong enter into competition with each other. The men themselves are under some pressure to display their personal autonomy, and they treat each other with considerable reserve as they get older. They cannot boss each other around or expect many favors from one another. Kaobawä, for example, cannot ask his adult brothers to perform menial tasks for him. This is because each man—particularly those men who compete for the same women—attempts to convince all others that he is capable of ferocity. The more remote the genealogical distance, the greater is the reserve with which mature agnates treat each other. That is, distant parallel cousins would behave toward each other with considerably more reserve than would actual brothers, although the men in question are all related to each other terminologically as brothers. If such men live in different villages, their mutual relationships are even more reserved when they meet.

The relationship between men who call each other brother-in-law, however, grows more intimate as the men get older. They can play and joke with each other, whereas agnates cannot, for they are not competitors and are not constrained to exhibit their fierceness to each other. They can cement their relationships to each other by merely promising to give their daughters to each other's sons. They can ask favors of each other, expecting them to be done without complaint.

Kaobawä's relationships to two men in his village illustrate the distinction between agnates and affines. Both men joined his group from the village of Patanowä-teri some time after Kaobawä's group separated from the village. One of the men, Nadeiwä, is related to him agnatically: they call each other "brother" because their fathers were half-brothers. Nadeiwä is in Kaobawä's local descent group, but is not quite on a par with the other members in the political affairs of the group. The other men in the group—Kaobawä and his closer brothers—put pressure on Nadeiwä to give his only daughter to a man in a distant Shamatari village for the purpose of stabilizing an alliance. This was a considerable sacrifice for him to make, as his daughter, after the completion of bride service, will have to live in her husband's village—Nadeiwä will have no coresident son-in-law to provide him with meat when he gets old. Kaobawä and Nadeiwä treat each other with respect and great reserve and do not ask each other for favors.

The other man, Kumamawä, is Bahimi's actual brother; Kaobawä is related to him, therefore, as an affine as well as by cognatic kinship ties. That is, they are first cross-cousins by blood and also related to each other by marriage. Kumamawä is a frequent visitor in Kaobawä's house and enthusiastically executes the numerous tasks that Kaobawä asks of him. They are members of different local descent groups, but their groups are related to each other by marriage exchanges that go back several generations. In short, Kaobawä's personal ties to his brother-in-law are warmer and friendlier than his relationship to one of the members of his own local descent group.

Daily Activities

Kaobawä's village is oval-shaped. His house is located among those of his agnatic kinsmen; they occupy a continuous arc along one side of the village. Each of the

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1965) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

Other status differences do exist and account for some variation in the activities of particular individuals. Rerebawä, for example, is an outsider to Kąobawä's group and has no intention of joining the village as a permanent resident. Consequently, he does not participate in the gardening activities and has considerably more spare time than other married men. He spends this time hunting for his wife and her parents, one of his obligations as a son-in-law. He is quite dependent on them for the bulk of his diet because they provide him with all his plantains. This is perhaps why he takes his hunting obligations so seriously and gives his game away so unflinchingly. He is quick to make reference to his hunting skills and generosity, perhaps to draw attention away from the fact that he does not cultivate food for his wife and children. He has been able to avoid making a garden because of his status as an outsider; he plans to return to his own village as soon as his bride service is over. But his in-laws want him to stay permanently so that he will be able to provide them with meat and garden produce when they are old. They have no sons to do this for them and have even promised Rerebawä their second daughter on the condition that he remain permanently in the village. They prevent Rerebawä from taking his wife and children home by keeping at least one of the children with them when Rerebawä goes to visit his own family. They know that his wife could not bear to be separated permanently from her child, and Rerebawä invariably brings her back home so that she can be with the child.

By Yąnomamö standards he has done enough bride service and deserves to be given his wife. Also, by their standards he has lived in the village so long that he should be obliged to make his own garden. But he can legitimately refuse to do this because he has discharged his obligations well beyond what was expected of him.

Kąobawä, on the other hand, has the special status of being his group's headman. Apart from this, he is also some fifteen years senior to Rerebawä and has a higher sense of obligation and responsibility to his family. Rerebawä, in addition to refusing to make a garden, thinks nothing of taking a week-long trip to visit friends, leaving his wife and children with her parents. His attitude toward the children, compared to Kąobawä's, is rather indifferent. Kąobawä had planned to accompany me to Caracas to see how foreigners live until Ariwari began crying and appealed to his father's paternal sensitivities. Kąobawä stepped out of the canoe, took off the clothing I had loaned him, and picked up Ariwari; "I can't go with you," he explained, "Ariwari will miss me and be sad."

Kąobawä thinks for the others in the village, many of whom are not able to perceive some of the less obvious implications of situations. In political matters he is the most astute man in group, but he so diplomatically exercises his influence that the others are not offended. Should someone be planning to do something that is potentially dangerous, he simply points out the danger and adds parenthetically, "Go ahead and do it if you want to, but don't expect sympathy from me if you get hurt." Shararaiwä, his youngest brother, planned to take a trip to a distant village with me. I knew that the two villages were not on particularly good terms with each other, but they were not actively at war. Kąobawä arrived at my canoe just as we were about to depart and asked me not to take Shararaiwä along, explaining that the Iyawei-teri might possibly molest him and precipitate hostilities between the two groups. Shararaiwä was willing to take a chance that my presence would be sufficient to deter any potential trouble, but Kąobawä would not risk it.

On another occasion a group of men from Patanowä-teri arrived to explore with

One of Damowä's brothers—who also participated in this raid—was married to one of the victim's daughters.

The Monou-teri had anticipated their raid by clearing a new garden site across the Mavaca River, where they hoped to take refuge after the inevitable revenge raids from Patanowä-teri began. They had hoped to complete their garden before the raids became intense, as the Mavaca River would have provided a natural obstacle to raiders. The Patanowä-teri, however, were infuriated by this killing and raided the Monou-teri immediately. Two of the raiders were Damowä's "brothers."

The raiders caught Damowä outside the new garden searching for honey. This was in the first week of February. He had two of his wives with him and one child. He was looking up a tree when the raiders shot a volley of arrows into his body, at least five of which struck him in the abdomen. He managed to nock one of his own arrows and shoot at the raiders, although he was probably mortally wounded at the time. The Bishewä, one of the raiders, shot a final arrow at Damowä, piercing his neck below his ear. He fell to the ground and died after being struck by this arrow.

The raiders did not attempt to abduct the women, as they were close to the Monou-teri campsite and they had to cross the Mavaca River to escape. The women ran back to the village to tell the others what happened. Instead of giving chase, as they ought to have done—according to Kąobawä and the others in Bisaasi-teri—the Monou-teri themselves fled into the jungle and hid until darkness, afraid that the raiders might return.

The man who fired the fatal arrow into Damowä's neck was a son of the man the Monou-teri shot in their raid. Two of the men who shot Damowä were his classificatory brothers (members of the same lineage), three were brothers-in-law (including the man who shot the fatal arrow), and one was a man who had been adopted into the Patanowä-teri village as a child, after he and his mother were abducted from a distant Shamatari village.

The Monou-teri burned the corpse of Damowä the next day. They held a mortuary ceremony that week and invited their allies, members of the two Shamatari villages and the two groups of Bisaasi-teri, to participate. Gourds of the dead man's ashes were given to specific men in several of the allied villages, an act calculated to reaffirm solidarity and friendship. Damowä's widows were given to his two eldest surviving brothers.

Kąobawä, a classificatory brother to Damowä, assumed the responsibility of organizing a revenge raid. Damowä's own brothers failed to step forward to assume this responsibility, and for a while there was no leadership whatsoever in Monou-teri. Finally, Orusiwä, the oldest and most competent member of the *Hor* lineage, emerged as the *de facto* village leader, a position he acquired largely by default. He was related to the slain headman as brother-in-law, and their respective descent groups dominated village politics.[2] Hence, leadership in Monou-teri shifted from the *Sha* lineage to the *Hor* lineage.

Kąobawä delayed the revenge raid until April, giving the Monou-teri time to expand their new garden. This date also coincided with the beginning of the rains, thus reducing the possibility of a retaliation until the next dry season and providing the Monou-teri even more time to expand their new garden and abandon the old one.

The Monou-teri were afraid to return to their producing garden, so they divided their time between their newly cleared site, where they worked at cutting timber and

[2] See Table 3-1 and Fig. 3-3 of Chapter 3 for the lineage composition of Monou-teri.